

1 [Counsel Listed Below]  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10 SAN FRANCISCO  
11

12 UniRAM TECHNOLOGY, INC., a California  
13 corporation,  
14

15 Plaintiff,  
16 v.  
17

18 MONOLITHIC SYSTEM TECHNOLOGY, a  
19 Delaware corporation; TAIWAN  
20 SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING  
21 COMPANY LTD., a Taiwan corporation, and  
22 TSMC NORTH AMERICA, a California  
23 corporation,  
24

25 Defendants.  
26  
27  
28

Case No. CV 04-01268-VRW

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER RE: UNIRAM'S RESPONSES  
TO INTERROGATORY NOS. 1, 2, 10,  
11, AND 12**

1                   WHEREAS, the parties desire to narrow and focus their disputes and cooperate on  
2 discovery,

3                   WHEREAS, the Court issued rulings on February 14, 2006 Ordering UniRAM to  
4 supplement its responses to Interrogatory Nos. 10 and 12 as set forth more fully in those rulings,

5                   In view of the foregoing, the parties HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:

6

7                   1. The date for UniRAM to respond to the Court's February 14, 2006 rulings is extended to  
8 and includes March 29, 2006.

9                   2. By March 29, 2006, UniRAM will respond to TSMC's Interrogatory No. 11 by listing  
10 which trade secrets UniRAM contends were not disclosed in UniRAM's patents.

11                  3. UniRAM will supplement the introductory text in its responses to TSMC's Interrogatory  
12 Nos. 1 and 2 so as to identify supporting documentation (on a claim by claim basis) with  
13 the same degree of specificity required by the Court's Orders concerning Interrogatory  
14 Nos. 10 and 12 no later than April 12, 2006. UniRAM agrees to supplement the tables  
15 only to the extent necessary to provide the requisite level of specificity for the materials  
16 cited in the introductory text of its responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2.

17                  4. The parties will meet and confer in person within a week of UniRAM's responses above  
18 to determine if they are acceptable to both parties.

1 Dated: March 3, 2006

By: /S/ Edward R. Reines  
Edward R. Reines  
Attorneys for Defendants  
Taiwan Semiconductor  
Manufacturing Company, Ltd, and  
TSMC North America

5 Dated: March 3, 2006

By: /S/ Tracy M. Clements  
Tracy M. Clements  
Attorneys for Defendant  
Monolithic System Technology

8 Dated: March 3, 2006

By: /S/ Joseph Grinstein  
Joseph Grinstein  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
UniRAM Technology Inc.

13 **ATTESTATION**

14 I hereby attest that I have on file all holograph signatures for any signatures  
15 indicated by a "conformed" signature (/S/) within this efiled document.

16

17

**ORDER**

18

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

19

Dated: March 6, 2006

By: Honorable Maria-Elena James

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28